

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-69 are pending in the application. No new matter is added. Claims 1-69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication Number 2005/0149617 A1 (hereinafter "Turnbull"). Applicants hereby traverse the rejection and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of the remarks set forth below.

Claim 1 and its Dependent Claims 2-69 Patentably Distinguish over Turnbull

As stated in the MPEP §2131, "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Claim 1 recites a method of managing contact events across an enterprise, comprising retrieving, updating, and disseminating information associated with a contact event. Thus, claim 1 recites a system that tracks and logs information associated with an event where a first party attempts to communicatively engage with a second party by initiating a communication transaction with the second party, and specifically, as recited in claim 5, wherein the first party attempts to communicate by a fax transmission, a telephone call, a pager message, an electronic text message, a still image communication, a video communication, an audio communication, a voice communication, an office visit, a paper-based communication, and any combination thereof.

Turnbull fails to disclose or teach a method of managing contact events across an enterprise explicitly as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner alleges that Turnbull teaches a method of managing contact events across an enterprise in Figures 1-3, 7-15, and paragraphs [0054] and [0055]. Applicants disagree. Turnbull discloses a system for managing contact information and call processing behavior customizations,

and does not teach a method of managing contact events. In particular, in paragraphs [0054] and [0055], Turnbull merely describes a system that manages information about contacts (i.e. email addresses, phone numbers) and user profiles (i.e. personalized greetings, service objects). Thus, Turnbull does not disclose a method to manage contact events (i.e. fax transmissions, office visits, as recited in claim 5), as explicitly recited in claim 1. For this reason, Turnbull does not describe all the elements of claim 1 as is required by MPEP §2131 to make a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and (e).

Furthermore, Turnbull does not teach the recited step of retrieving, updating and disseminating information associated with a contact event.

The Examiner alleges that retrieving, updating, and disseminating information associated with a contact event is disclosed in paragraphs [0054], [0055], [0070-0073], and [0082]. Applicants disagree. Turnbull discloses a system that manages "service objects", and does not manage information associated with contact events. In paragraph [0073], Turnbull defines these "service objects" as data objects that "contains data describing how a call should be processed." As listed in Table 1 of Turnbull, examples of "service objects" are: "Dial by Extension", "Hang Up", and "Play Announcement". The method recited in claim 1 tracks and logs contact event by retrieving, and updating and disseminating the information associated with said contact event. Turnbull merely discloses a method to create "service objects" for call processing behaviors, and does not disclose a method to track or log information associated with a contact event. For this reason as well, Turnbull does not describe all the elements of claim 1 as is required by MPEP §2131 to make a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and (e).

Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejections of independent claim 1. Claims 2-69 depend from amended independent claim 1 and add further limitations thereto. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(e) rejections of claims 1-69.

Application No. 10/731,689
Amendment dated September 19, 2008
Reply to Office Action of March 19, 2008

Docket No.: ZBBF-P01-001

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-1945, under Order No. ZBBF-P01-001 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: September 19, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By

Edward J. Kelly

Registration No.: 38,936

ROPES & GRAY LLP

One International Place

Boston, Massachusetts 02110

(617) 951-7000

(617) 951-7050 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant